

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Daniel Talero	Team: Squad #08	CCRB Case #: 202207967	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Wednesday, 11/09/2022 7:18 PM	Location of Incident: 375 Pleasant Avenue	18 Mo. SOL 5/9/2024	Precinct: 25		
Date/Time CV Reported Fri, 11/18/2022 11:40 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: On-line website	Date/Time Received at CCRB Fri, 11/18/2022 11:40 PM		
Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address			
Witness(es)	Home Address				
Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command		
1. LT William Rivera	00000	946705	025 PCT		
Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name		
1. PO Henry Gregorek	05126	963555	025 PCT		
2. An officer					
3. PO Nicholas Lamere	23697	969878	025 PCT		
Officer(s)	Allegation			Investigator Recommendation	
A . LT William Rivera	Abuse: Lieutenant William Rivera threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b)				
B . LT William Rivera	Abuse: Lieutenant William Rivera stopped § 87(2)(b)				

Case Summary

On November 18, 2022, § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint via the CCRB's website.

On November 9, 2022, at approximately 7:18pm, § 87(2)(b) a NYC Housing Preservation and Development Inspector, arrived at 375 Pleasant Avenue in Manhattan, to investigate an anonymous heat complaint in the building. A tenant recorded § 87(2)(b) while in the vestibule and called 911. Police Officer Henry Gregorek, Police Officer Nicholas Lamere, and Lieutenant William Rivera, all of the 25th Precinct, arrived and spoke with § 87(2)(b). Lt. Rivera threatened to arrest and then stopped § 87(2)(b) (**Allegations A-B: Abuse of Authority; § 87(2)(g)**). The officers ultimately released § 87(2)(b) without further incident. No arrest or summons resulted from this incident.

BWC footage was obtained from NYPD Legal. It is contained in IA#39 (**Board Review 01**) and summarized in IA#53 (**Board Review 02**).

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation (A) Abuse of Authority: Lieutenant William Rivera threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (B) Abuse of Authority: Lieutenant William Rivera stopped § 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b) who was working as a NYC Housing Preservation and Development inspector, testified (**Board Review 03-05**) that on November 9, 2022, at approximately 7:18pm, he responded to an anonymous heat complaint at 375 Pleasant Avenue in Manhattan. § 87(2)(b) stood outside of the front door of the building and pressed the buttons on the intercom saying, "This is a city inspector. Do you have heat or hot water in your apartment?" to no response. § 87(2)(b) was wearing a black t-shirt with an HPD emblem, a black jacket over the t-shirt, and a backpack. § 87(2)(b) did not take his jacket off because it was cold. An unidentified white woman approached § 87(2)(b) from inside of the building and said, "Who are you?" § 87(2)(b) who is a Black male, responded that he is a city inspector and was checking on the heat. He proceeded to show her his HPD badge but saw the woman was recording him. § 87(2)(b) stopped short of showing the woman the identification portion of the badge as under HPD protocol he had a right to decline due to her recording.

§ 87(2)(b) exited the building, called his supervisor, § 87(2)(b) and reported the interaction. The woman approached him and said the 911 operator wished to speak with him. § 87(2)(b) explained the situation and the 911 operator told the woman that she had no right to record § 87(2)(b). PO Gregorek and PO Lamere arrived on scene in a marked blue and white NYPD "Jeep" and approached § 87(2)(b). The woman returned inside of the building. § 87(2)(b) introduced himself as a housing inspector and again explained the interaction with the woman.

Lt. Rivera arrived in a marked blue and white NYPD SUV and approached § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) again identified himself as an HPD housing inspector. Lt. Rivera asked what HPD was, and § 87(2)(b) said, "Were you born yesterday?" Lt. Rivera responded, "You know we can do this in the precinct if you want to be on some street talk," and did not provide any additional explanation as to why they would go to the precinct. Lt. Rivera asked § 87(2)(b) if he had anything that could identify him, and § 87(2)(b) said he had his "HPD device," which is a work cellphone with his name and HPD written on the lock screen. Lt. Rivera ordered § 87(2)(b) to call his supervisor and § 87(2)(b) called § 87(2)(b) again. Lt. Rivera yelled at § 87(2)(b) and asked him where HPD operates a few times. § 87(2)(b) responded, "94 Broadway." Lt. Rivera acknowledged the address, ended the call, and returned the phone to § 87(2)(b).

Lt. Rivera asked for § 87(2)(b) identification, and § 87(2)(b) responded he had a badge. Lt. Rivera said "Badge? What are you trying to be a cop all of a sudden?" § 87(2)(b) explained that it was an inspector badge given to every HPD inspector and handed it to Lt. Rivera. Lt. Rivera asked

how he would know it was real. § 87(2)(b) said that it was city identification and Lt. Rivera walked behind § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) believed Lt. Rivera was going to handcuff him and asked what he was doing. Lt. Rivera said, “What do you think I’m doing?” § 87(2)(b) and Lt. Rivera yelled at each other before § 87(2)(b) said all he had on him was his city ID. Lt. Rivera took a photograph of the ID and returned it to § 87(2)(b) alongside a business card with a phone number written on it. Lt. Rivera returned to his police vehicle and drove away. PO Gregorek and PO Lamere offered business cards, which § 87(2)(b) rejected, and left.

PO Gregorek’s BWC (**Board Review 01**) captures PO Gregorek and PO Lamere exit their vehicle and approach § 87(2)(b) at the 01:00 minute mark. A white woman stands in the doorway of a building with her cellphone out. At 01:05, § 87(2)(b) says he works for “HPD,” that he received an anonymous complaint, and that a woman approached him recording while he attempted to show her his ID. At 01:20, § 87(2)(b) hands PO Gregorek a gold shield with an HPD work ID inside of a plastic sleeve. PO Gregorek asks for a “regular” ID and § 87(2)(b) says that he only has the work ID and that he received an anonymous complaint regarding the building’s heat. At 01:55, PO Gregorek asks § 87(2)(b) where they start work and § 87(2)(b) says, “all over.” At 02:09, Lt. Rivera approaches § 87(2)(b).

Lt. Rivera’s BWC (**Board Review 01**) captures Lt. Rivera exit his police vehicle and approach § 87(2)(b). At 01:09, § 87(2)(b) displays his HPD shield. Lt. Rivera says, “Do you have ID? I don’t know what that is.” § 87(2)(b) flips the shield, which displays an NYC HPD employee identification card that displays § 87(2)(b) photograph above his first and last name and an HPD logo. Lt. Rivera asks § 87(2)(b) to remove his identification, which he does, and further asks where § 87(2)(b) works. § 87(2)(b) says “HPD...311...” Lt. Rivera asks, “What does it stand for, HPD?” At 01:25, § 87(2)(b) says, “Wow, must be new, Housing of Preservation and Development.” Lt. Rivera responds, “We can go back to the precinct and do this if you like. Don’t be sarcastic, I’m asking you questions that are legitimate. You may know NYPD, but I don’t know every agency on the planet, alright? Take it (the identification card) out and your state ID.”

At 01:41, § 87(2)(b) says, “I don’t have my state ID. This is all I have,” and hands Lt. Rivera his ID. Lt. Rivera says, “So how do I know that this is real? I can’t verify this with a real ID,” as he examines it. Lt. Rivera asks for the complainant and PO Gregorek says she is inside. At 01:57, Lt. Rivera asks, “What led you to show your ID to a person that lives in a residential building?” § 87(2)(b) says, “I’m going (sic) here just to do an inspection and the complaint was anonymous and so she came out recording. I’m not supposed to show her my ID while she’s recording.”

At 02:18, Lt. Rivera requests paperwork proving that there is an inspection. PO Gregorek asks how the job is received and if it is through his phone. § 87(2)(b) says “Yes,” and Lt. Rivera asks how he could verify that he is working. At 02:30, § 87(2)(b) displays his work phone and Lt. Rivera immediately says to call a supervisor without examining the phone. § 87(2)(b) asks if he can get his ID back afterwards. Lt. Rivera says, “No I’m going to keep your ID for the whole remainder of the day.” § 87(2)(b) says, “Eh, nothing changes but it is what it is.” Lt. Rivera says, “You’re working right?” § 87(2)(b) says he is. Lt. Rivera says, “Alright so act professional because you’re working. You’re not in your street self.” At 02:57, § 87(2)(b) pauses and says “Wow.” § 87(2)(b) puts the phone up to his ear and Lt. Rivera repeats that § 87(2)(b) should be professional.

At 03:00, § 87(2)(b) speaks to his supervisor, § 87(2)(b) on the phone. Lt. Rivera orders § 87(2)(b) to put § 87(2)(b) on speaker which he does. After introductions, Lt. Rivera asks where their office is. § 87(2)(b) says they are HPD. Lt. Rivera says “Yeah, I know. You don’t have an office?” § 87(2)(b) says something but is drowned out by a radio communication. Lt. Rivera says, “what?” and § 87(2)(b) asks what is going on. Lt. Rivera says, “I am trying to verify your employee. It says

Alejandro, I'm trying to find out who you are." At 03:45, the officers ask where they begin their tour. § 87(2)(b) says, "94 Old Broadway." § 87(2)(b) asks why the officers are trying to intimidate him. Lt. Rivera shouts "Sir, this is the police department someone called because they think that your employees (sic) is pretending to be a cop."

At 04:16, § 87(2)(b) says, "Cop?" § 87(2)(b) says, "Oh really?" and laughs. § 87(2)(b) says, "Now you're switching my words around now." PO Gregorek says, "Let me explain the situation. We received a call..." before Lt. Rivera cuts him off and shouts "94," while looking at his department phone. § 87(2)(b) says his inspector called him saying that a tenant was recording him. Lt. Rivera says, "That's not why we were called. He can tell you anything he likes, but that's not why we were called." At 04:40, Lt. Rivera asks for the location again and § 87(2)(b) confirms that it's 94 Old Broadway. At 04:47, PO Gregorek says they received a 911 call for a suspicious person and there was someone trying to enter a building by presenting a shield and ID. § 87(2)(b) says he understands but that Lt. Rivera is accusing him of pretending to be a police officer. At 05:01, Lt. Rivera zooms into a photograph of a Google Street-View image of 94 Old Broadway. At 05:21, Lt. Rivera shouts, "Sir what you don't understand is I'm over here trying to verify everything. I'm not a psychic. I'm not a mind reader." § 87(2)(b) says "What you have to understand is that we are city employees. We are civil servants." Lt. Rivera interjects, "I'm done having this conversation with you."

At 05:36, § 87(2)(b) asks for his ID back. Lt. Rivera says, "What's that building you're working in? what else do you have?" § 87(2)(b) asks for his ID back again. At 05:47, Lt. Rivera says "No, no, I'm verifying you now." § 87(2)(b) repeats his request for his ID. Lt. Rivera takes a step towards § 87(2)(b) and says, "No, no, I'm not done verifying you," while pointing his finger in § 87(2)(b) face. They go back and forth repeating their statements two times. Throughout this conversation § 87(2)(b) is requesting to speak with § 87(2)(b). At 05:58, PO Gregorek circles around § 87(2)(b) standing behind him while Lt. Rivera says "I can't verify who you are right now. Listen to me carefully." § 87(2)(b) says, "My inspector is being respectful." Lt. Rivera steps towards § 87(2)(b) stepping up onto the sidewalk. PO Lamere stands close to § 87(2)(b) who is surrounded by officers. At 06:02, Lt. Rivera says, "You're not being respectful, sir. I don't even know who you are." § 87(2)(b) looks surprised and says, "Are you kidding me right now?" Lt. Rivera says, "94 Old Broadway." PO Lamere says to answer the question. § 87(2)(b) says that he works there. Lt. Rivera says he knows the building and asks what else is in the building. § 87(2)(b) says, "NYPD is also over there." Lt. Rivera says, "Thank you, that's how you verify stuff." At 06:30, Lt. Rivera begins to walk away and orders PO Lamere to get § 87(2)(b) information for a stop report. Lt. Rivera walks back to his police vehicle and rummages through his wallet before approaching PO Gregorek and handing him a business card. Lt. Rivera walks back to his police vehicle and enters it.

Lt. Rivera testified (**Board Review 06**) that he received information via radio transmission regarding a suspicious male who displayed a badge inside of the building. Lt. Rivera believed that individual to be a police officer solely due to the dispatcher's use of the word "badge." Once Lt. Rivera arrived on scene, he saw that PO Gregorek and PO Lamere had already stopped § 87(2)(b). Neither officer provided Lt. Rivera with any additional information regarding § 87(2)(b) or the incident. § 87(2)(b) displayed his inspector shield, which Lt. Rivera was not familiar with, upon request. He testified it looked like an NYPD Detective's shield, which was gold and had numbers on the bottom. Lt. Rivera requested § 87(2)(b) state ID. § 87(2)(b) displayed a white work ID which contained § 87(2)(b) name, though Lt. Rivera did not recall any additional descriptors of the ID. § 87(2)(b) said he was with "HPD," which Lt. Rivera was not familiar with and believed was shorthand for a police department. Lt. Rivera testified that other than his own lack of familiarity, there was no other reason that the identification was suspicious.

Lt. Rivera asked § 87(2)(b) what “HPD” meant. § 87(2)(b) responded by saying, “You must be new.” Lt. Rivera asked if § 87(2)(b) would “feel better doing this at the precinct.” Lt. Rivera denied threatening to arrest § 87(2)(b) and instead testified that he asked § 87(2)(b) if he would like to return to the precinct because, “if § 87(2)(b) had been a police officer and [Lt. Rivera] had difficulty verifying who he was on scene, then [they] would have to go back to the precinct and speak to the commanding officer and he would have to validate § 87(2)(b) duty status.”

Lt. Rivera asked § 87(2)(b) for paperwork proving that he had on-duty business at the location. § 87(2)(b) said that he was 311 HPD and that he had a report of no heat in the building and that he had a work cellphone. Lt. Rivera did not observe any distinguishing markings indicating that it was a work phone, and noted § 87(2)(b) was not wearing a uniform. Lt. Rivera looked at the phone and saw the home screen. Lt. Rivera said § 87(2)(b) had nothing to corroborate that he was a city employee or a police officer and had not determined if § 87(2)(b) was or was not a member of service.

Lt. Rivera ordered § 87(2)(b) to call his supervisor, which § 87(2)(b) did. § 87(2)(b) supervisor answered the phone and became argumentative, accusing the officers of attempting to intimidate his employee. Lt. Rivera asked where they “turned out of” and § 87(2)(b) supervisor said 94 Old Broadway. Lt. Rivera conducted a Google search for the address and did not find any relationship between the address and HPD. Lt. Rivera then conducted a Google Map search, saw an image of the building, and realized he was familiar with the building, though he did not see anything on the image linking the building to HPD.

§ 87(2)(b) asked for his ID and attempted to leave. Lt. Rivera said he would not give it back because he was not done verifying who § 87(2)(b) was. Lt. Rivera later acknowledged that he said he would not give § 87(2)(b) ID back for the rest of the day, which he noted he said due to “sarcasm.” Lt. Rivera also acknowledged telling § 87(2)(b) that he was not in his “street self,” and said he did so because it was his way of telling § 87(2)(b) that his earlier comments were uncalled for. § 87(2)(b) repeated that he wanted his ID and wanted to leave. Lt. Rivera asked § 87(2)(b) if he could provide some information about his workplace. § 87(2)(b) said there were other NYPD Units inside the building and Lt. Rivera determined that was satisfactory proof that § 87(2)(b) was a city employee. Lt. Rivera added that he was still unsure if § 87(2)(b) was on duty with work-related business or off duty and there for other reasons. Lt. Rivera provided § 87(2)(b) with a contact card and told him, “Thank you that’s how you verify who you are by answering basic questions.” Lt. Rivera left the scene, resumed patrol, and did not interact with § 87(2)(b) after leaving the scene.

During his CCRB interview, the undersigned informed Lt. Rivera that § 87(2)(b) explained that HPD stood for Housing of Preservation and Development prior to the request to return to the stationhouse. Lt. Rivera somewhat altered his testimony and denied believing that HPD stood for a police department after § 87(2)(b) had explained it, yet he also continued to deny that he had ruled out that § 87(2)(b) was pretending to be a police officer. Lt. Rivera acknowledged that § 87(2)(b) never said he was a police officer in front of Lt. Rivera. Lt. Rivera added that he wanted to verify § 87(2)(b) identity at the stationhouse by sitting down, having a calm discussion, and by making phone calls, instead of having a conversation on the street.

Lt. Rivera denied that the same investigatory process was possible on the street, however he was unable to articulate what he needed at the stationhouse specifically, and instead repeated that he needed to “figure it out” at the stationhouse. Lt. Rivera testified that he has had thousands of interactions where he has verified a city employees’ identity and that he usually verifies via a state

ID, and that a driver's license gives credence to an employee ID. Lt. Rivera acknowledged that if a person provided their name and date of birth verbally, he would be able to look up their identity on his department phone, but added that it would not matter because he would be unable to get a photograph of them. Lt. Rivera also acknowledged he would be able to conduct a DMV search using the same information and denied that DMV records displayed photographs. Lt. Rivera acknowledged that he had access to 311 records on his department phone but added that he did not attempt to access these records because the 311 complaints did not go to the NYPD. Lt. Rivera acknowledged that § 87(2)(b) did not refuse to answer any questions, but said he was unable to determine if § 87(2)(b) provided any false or inconsistent information.

§ 87(2)(b) called 911 (**Board Review 07**) to report that § 87(2)(b) was claiming to be a city inspector, was pushing buzzers, and while he showed her a badge, he would not provide his name or ID. § 87(2)(b) also reported that the man was dressed in all black and would not show his ID because she was recording him. At 04:20 of the call, the operator speaks with § 87(2)(b) who says he is a city inspector from HPD, and that when he showed his badge the female caller began recording and that he is not supposed to show his information when someone is recording. At 05:20, the operator tells the female caller that she should not be recording his ID and they argue briefly before officers arrive on scene and § 87(2)(b) ends the call.

Lt. Rivera's memo book (**Board Review 08**) does not mention that he believed § 87(2)(b) to be a police officer and reads § 87(2)(b) "Immaturity did not validate his professionalism."

Stop Report § 87(2)(b) (**Board Review 09**), prepared by PO Gregorek and reviewed by Lt. Rivera, did not mention any suspicion of § 87(2)(b) being a police officer and notes that the officers determined § 87(2)(b) was a housing inspector prior to Lt. Rivera assuming control of the stop. The stop report also notes that § 87(2)(b) "did become dismissive of Lt. and displayed unprofessional disrespect upon further questioning."

A request for warrant audits (**Board Review 08**) for § 87(2)(b) returned negative results.

A 311 search (**Board Review 10**) returned positive results for 311 HPD complaints on the incident date. Complaints § 87(2)(b) reported at 6:10pm, and § 87(2)(b) reported at 7:07pm, both on November 9, 2022, complained of lack of heat/hot water at the incident address. An HPD online search (**Board Review 11**) returned HPD Complaints § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) on November 9, 2022, for no heat at the incident address.

A search of public NYC employee records (**Board Review 12**) confirmed that § 87(2)(b) was employed by HPD on the incident date.

A Google search for "94 Old Broadway" (**Board Review 13**) returned "Housing of Preservation and Development" as the top three search results.

A Google map search for "94 Old Broadway" (**Board Review 14**) returned a street view image with the exterior of a building with a banner with "Housing of Preservation and Development" written on it.

NY Penal Law, Section 190.26, (**Board Review 15**) states that a person is guilty of criminal impersonation in the first degree when they pretend to be a police officer or a federal law enforcement member.

NY Penal Law, Section 190.25, (**Board Review 16**) states that a person is guilty of criminal

impersonation in the second degree when they pretend to be a representative of some person or organization, or pretends to be a public servant, and does an act in such pretended capacity with intent to obtain a benefit or to injure or defraud another.

NYPD Patrol Guide, Section 212-11 (**Board Review 17**) finds that when a persons' freedom of movement is restricted and they are temporarily detained, it is categorized as a Level III encounter, or Terry Stop. Such enforcement must be rooted in reasonable suspicion that the person has committed, is committing, or is about to commit a felony or Penal Law misdemeanor, at which point the member of service may stop and detain for the purpose of conducting a criminal investigation. A suspect may be detained only as long as necessary to confirm or dispel suspicion and the authority to detain the suspect ends when the tasks tied to the reason for the stop were completed. Refusal to answer questions or produce identification does not establish probable cause and absent probable cause a person may not be removed to a department facility for further investigation because they refused to produce identification.

Lt. Rivera initially testified that he told § 87(2)(b) that they could "go back to the precinct," because he suspected § 87(2)(b) was a police officer and he needed his commanding officer to verify § 87(2)(b) identity. Lt. Rivera said he suspected § 87(2)(b) was a police officer because the 911 operator reported a person with a "badge" and that he believed HPD may have been shorthand for a police department. The BWC captures § 87(2)(b) display his HPD shield, his HPD work identification card, and verbally identify himself as a housing inspector for the NYC Department of Housing of Preservation and Development, prior to Lt. Rivera making the statement. The BWC additionally captures Lt. Rivera accuse § 87(2)(b) of impersonating a police officer two minutes after § 87(2)(b) had already identified himself. Lt. Rivera makes the statement in response to § 87(2)(b) saying, "you must be new" and after telling § 87(2)(b) that they could "go back to the precinct," he continued by telling § 87(2)(b) to "not be sarcastic," and that he "did not know ever city agency on the planet," and ordered § 87(2)(b) to remove his identification. Lt. Rivera later testified that he told § 87(2)(b) to not be his "street self," to tell him that his comments were uncalled for and that he was being sarcastic when he told § 87(2)(b) he would keep his ID for the rest of the day.

§ 87(2)(g)

Lt. Rivera testified that he suspected § 87(2)(b) of impersonating either a police officer or a city employee. As discussed above, § 87(2)(b) was not presenting himself as a police officer and Lt. Rivera had no reason to believe this was the case.

At the time Lt. Rivera stopped § 87(2)(b) from leaving, § 87(2)(b) had provided a work ID which contained his name and photograph and had "HPD" written on it. He provided an official city shield that is issued to city employees, he had identified himself as a Housing Inspector working for HPD, he informed the officers he was at the incident location due to a 311 complaint, he had called his supervisor who identified § 87(2)(b) as his employee, and both he and his supervisor had provided the location of their office. At no point did § 87(2)(b) disobey any of the officer's orders, nor did he provide any false or inconsistent information.

At the time Lt. Rivera stopped § 87(2)(b) from leaving, Lt. Rivera dismissed § 87(2)(b) attempts

to display his HPD cellphone that contained the 311 records and instead told him to call his supervisor. Lt. Rivera did not make any further requests for 311 records or to examine the cell phone. Lt. Rivera conducted a Google search, which he testified showed no association between the address provided by § 87(2)(b) and HPD. This was contradicted by the searches conducted by the investigation that showed that all the top results returned HPD at the address and that Google Street View displayed an HPD banner outside of the building. Lt. Rivera additionally testified that he usually verifies city employee's identities with a state ID. However, Lt. Rivera had not conducted a single search of § 87(2)(b) or the incident location, using his department phone, despite having access to DMV records, NYPD Databases, publicly accessible city employee records, and 311 records.

While Lt. Rivera testified he stopped § 87(2)(b) from leaving because he had not finished verifying § 87(2)(b) identity, due to the extent to which Lt. Rivera focused on § 87(2)(b) behavior and professionalism, both during and after the incident, including in his memo book entry, the stop report which he reviewed, and in his CCRB testimony, the investigation determined that Lt. Rivera's actions were motivated by his personal anger or frustration with § 87(2)(b) conduct, and not from a genuine concern or question over § 87(2)(b) identity. Lt. Rivera prevented § 87(2)(b) from leaving so he could ask § 87(2)(b) questions based on his personal memory of the building in which § 87(2)(b) worked. Given the amount of information § 87(2)(b) had already provided, and the myriad of alternative methods available to Lt. Rivera to confirm § 87(2)(b) identity and his status as a city employee, § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- This is the first CCRB complaint to which § 87(2)(b) has been a party (**Board Review 18**).
- Lt. Rivera has been a member-of-service for 14 years and has been a subject in three additional CCRB complaints and five additional allegations, none of which were substantiated. § 87(2)(g)

Mediation, Civil, and Criminal Histories

- § 87(2)(b) declined to mediate this complaint.
- As of April 25, 2023, the New York City Office of the Comptroller has no record of a Notice of Claim being filed in regards to this incident (**Board Review 19**).
- [§ 87(2)(b)] [§§ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(c)]

Squad: 08

Investigator:	<u>Daniel Talero</u>	<u>Inv. Daniel Talero</u>	<u>06/05/2023</u>
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

Squad Leader:	<u>Ethan De Angelo</u>	<u>IM Ethan De Angelo</u>	<u>06/06/2023</u>
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

